

सं. ओ.वि./जी०जी०एन०/95-85/45838.—चूंकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल की राय है कि मै. निब्रो लि० दिल्ली रोड, गुडगांव, के श्रमिक श्री ओम प्रकाश तथा उसके प्रबन्धकों के मध्य इसमें इसके बाद लिखित मामले में कोई औद्योगिक विवाद है;

और चूंकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल विवाद को न्यायनिर्णय हेतु निर्दिष्ट करना वांछनीय समझते हैं;

इसलिए, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947, की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) द्वारा प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल इसके द्वारा सरकारी अधिसूचना सं. 5415-3-अम-68/15254, दिनांक 20 जून, 1968, के साथ पढ़ते हुए अधिसूचना सं. 11495-जी-अम-57/11245, दिनांक 7 फरवरी, 1958, द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय, फरीदाबाद, को विवादग्रस्त या उससे सुसंगत या उससे संबंधित नीचे लिखा मामला न्यायनिर्णय एवं पंचाट तीन मास में देने हेतु निर्दिष्ट करते हैं, जो कि उक्त प्रबन्धकों तथा श्रमिक के बीच या तो विवादग्रस्त मामला है या विवाद से सुसंगत अथवा सम्बन्धित मामला है :—

क्या श्री ओम प्रकाश की सेवाओं का समापन न्यायोचित तथा ठीक है? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस राहत का हकदार है?

सं० ओ.वि./गुडगांव/118-85/45845—चूंकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल की राय है कि मै. विनेक्स, प्लॉट नं० 24, इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, धारुहेड़ा गुडगांव, के श्रमिक श्री जगत साह, तथा उसके प्रबन्धकों के मध्य इसमें इसके बाद लिखित मामले में कोई औद्योगिक विवाद है;

और चूंकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल विवाद को न्यायनिर्णय हेतु निर्दिष्ट करना वांछनीय समझते हैं;

इसलिए, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947, की धारा 10 की उप धारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) द्वारा प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हरियाणा के राज्यपाल इसके द्वारा सरकारी अधिसूचना सं. 5415-3-अम-68/15254, दिनांक 20 जून, 1968, के साथ पढ़ते हुए अधिसूचना सं. 11495-जी-अम-57/11245, दिनांक 7 फरवरी, 1958, द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय, फरीदाबाद, को विवादग्रस्त या उससे सुसंगत या उससे सम्बन्धित नीचे लिखा मामला न्यायनिर्णय एवं पंचाट तीन मास में देने हेतु निर्दिष्ट करते हैं जो कि उक्त प्रबन्धकों तथा श्रमिक के बीच या तो विवादग्रस्त मामला है या विवाद से सुसंगत अथवा संबंधित मामला है :—

क्या श्री जगत साह की सेवाओं का समापन न्यायोचित तथा ठीक है? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस राहत का हकदार है?

जे० पी० रतन,

उप सचिव, हरियाणा सरकार,
श्रम विभाग ।

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 4th October, 1985

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/8174.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bazaz Industries, Industrial Area, Kunj Pura Road, Karnal.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V.P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER.
LABOUR COURT, AMBALA

Ref. No. 91 of 1985

between

SHRI FAQUIR CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS BAZAZ INDUSTRIES, INDUSTRIAL AREA, KUNJPURA ROAD, KARNAL

Present—

Shri Jang Bahadur, for workman.

Shri J. B. Singh, for respondent.

AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, in the exercise of powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the dispute between Shri Faquir Chand, workman and the management of Messrs Bazaz Industries, Industrial Area, Kunjpura Road, Karnal. The terms of the reference are as under :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Faquir Chand, workman, was justified and in order ? If not to what relief is he entitled to ?”

Workman Faquir Chand has challenged the management alleging that the termination order dated 1st December, 1983, is illegal and not sustainable. He prayed for re-instatement with continuity in service and with full back wages.

Respondent-management appeared. Both the parties compromised the dispute. Their statements have been recorded. The workman has waived of his all rights on receipt of Rs 1,000 (Rupees one thousand only), so the reference is disposed of in view of the compromise arrived at between the parties. I pass my award regarding the dispute in hand accordingly.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

Dated 22nd August, 1985.

Endorsement No. 2067, dated Ambala City, the 11th September, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab./8165.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Haryana Roadways, Kaithal :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
AMBALA

Reference No. 168 of 1984
(Old No. 28 of 1983)
between

SHRI JAGGU RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF HARYANA
ROADWAYS, KAITHAL

resent :—

Shri Rajeshwar for workman.
Shri A. R. Goyal for the respondent.

AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the dispute between Shri Jaggu Ram, workman and the management of Haryana Roadways, Kaithal to Labour Court, Faridabad. The terms of the reference are as under :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Jaggu Ram, workman, was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled to ?”

On constitution of Labour Court at Ambala the reference was received by transfer.

Workman Jaggu Ram alleged that he was employed in the service of respondent-management in July, 1978 and served the respondent upto 1982. On 5th April, 1982, respondent, without any notice and without any payment of retrenchment compensation, terminated his services in violation of section 25 (f) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and he has prayed for re-instatement with continuity in service and with full back wages.

Respondent contended that workman was accommodated in place of his brother Lachhu Ram on daily wages. When regular candidates were recruited services of Jaggu Ram workman were automatically terminated. It was also urged that the workman is not at all entitled to any relief claimed for.

On the pleadings of the parties the following issues have been framed:—

Issue No. I—

Whether the termination order dated 5th April, 1982 is justified as per reference ? If not, its effect ?

Issue No. II—

Relief.

I have gone through the evidence placed on the file and have heard the authorised representatives of the parties. My issue-wise findings are as under :—

Issue No. I—

In support of this issue respondent-management examined [Shri Sushil Kumar Clerk who supported of the respondent. But in cross-examination he could not afford to deny that no notice was given, no pay in lieu of notice period nor retrenchment compensation were paid to the workman which clearly shows that there was a violation of section 25 (f) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Workman supported his case while coming in the witness box. Admission statement of MW-1 for non-compliance of provisions of section 25 (f) of the I.D. Act, 1947, in spite of the fact that regular candidates were recruited in place of daily wages will lead to the conclusion that termination order passed by the General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Kaithal is violative to section 25 (f) of the I. D. Act. Accordingly it is unjust and not binding on the workman. Hence, this issue is decided in favour of workman and against the management.

Issue No. II—

On the basis of my findings on issue No. I termination order regarding the services of workman is set-aside. Workman is entitled to re-instatement with continuity in service as well as with full back wages.

I pass my award regarding the dispute accordingly.

Date August, 1985.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endst. No. 1891, dated 16th August, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the I. D. Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/8175.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Shakumeri Metal Works, New Market near Central Bank of India, Jagadhri (Ambala) :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
AMBALA

Ref. No. 395 of 1984

(Old No. 260 of 1982)

between

SHRI RAM RAJ WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS SHAKUMERI
METAL WORKS, NEW MARKET NEAR CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA, JAGADHRI (AMBALA).
YAMUNA NAGAR

Present.—

Shri Surinder Sharma, for workman.
None for respondent.

AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the dispute between Shri Ram Raj, workman and the management of Messrs Shakumari, Metal Works, Jagadhri to Labour Court, Faridabad. The terms of the reference are as under :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Raj, workman, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled to?”

Workman Ram Raj has challenged the respondent-management alleging that he joined services of the respondent on 1st July, 1980 and worked upto 16th August, 1981. His services were terminated without inquiry, any notice or making payment of any compensation towards notice period or retrenchment compensation were also not paid. He has prayed the relief of reinstatement with continuity in service and with full back wages.

The case was fixed for service of respondent-management which could not be served. Shri Surinder Sharma authorised representative of workman made statement that respondent firm has since been closed. He wants to take his case back with permission to file afresh if permitted by law.

In view of above statement of workman's authorised representative he is allowed to withdraw this reference with permission to file afresh one if permitted by law. I pass my award regarding the dispute in hand accordingly.

Dated the 24th August, 1985.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endorsement No. 2069, dated the 11th September, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/5/84-Lab./8176.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Marketing-cum-Processing Society, Samalkha :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
AMBALA

Reference No. 279 of 1984

(Old No. 121 of 1981)

SHRI RAM BOOL SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS
MARKETING-CUM-PROCESSING SOCIETY, SAMALKHA

Present—

None for workman.

Shri Surinder Kaushal for respondent.

AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the dispute between Shri Ram Bool Singh, workman and the management of Messrs Marketing-cum-Processing Society, Samalkha to Labour Court, Faridabad. The terms of the reference are as under :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Bool Singh, workman, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled to?”

On constitution of Labour Court at Ambala the reference was received by transfer.

Workman Ram Bhood Singh has challenged the respondent-management that his services were terminated illegally in contravention of section 25 (f) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Notices of this reference were issued to parties. Respondent appeared and contested it and refuted the allegations of the workman. To day the case was fixed for applicant's evidence. Parties submitted compromise deed Ex-C-1. According to that workman has received all the dues from the respondent society. He has waived his right of re-employment so the matter is disposed of accordingly as compromised.

I pass my award regarding the dispute in question as per compromise Ex-C-1.

Dated the 22nd August, 1985.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endst. No. 2066, dated Ambala City, the 11th September, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Govt. Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/8189.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Haryana Roadways, Jind Depot, Jind (Haryana) :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
AMBALA AT AMBALA CITY

Ref. No. 148 of 1984

(Old No. 19 of 1983)

SHRI BHOJ RAJ, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF HARYANA
ROADWAYS, JIND DEPOT, JIND (HARYANA)

Present:—

Shri Sham Sunder Gupta, for workman.

Shri A. R. Goyal, for respondent.

AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the dispute, between Shri Bhoj Raj, workman and the management of Haryana Roadways, Jind Depot, Jind to Labour Court, Rohtak. The terms of the reference are as under :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Bhoj Raj, workman, was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled to ?”

Shri Bhoj Raj, workman, alleged that he joined the services of the respondent-management in February, 1980 and his services were terminated by the respondent-management on 31st March, 1982 in contravention of section 25(f) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The workman has claimed the relief of re-instatement with continuity in service with full back wages.

Respondant-management contested the case and contended that the petition is not maintainable because workman did not exhaust all the departmental remedy before knocking the doors of the Labour Court. In fact he joined as Helper (Painter) on 11th May, 1981, since the services of workman Shri Bhoj Raj were no longer required so his services were discontinued on 31st March, 1982. The order is just and legal. It was also contended that the workman have not completed 240 days, so provisions of Section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 are not attracted.

On the pleadings of the parties the following issues have been framed :—

Issue No. 1.—

Whether termination order dated 31st March, 1982 as reference is legal ? If not, its effect ? OPR.

Issue No. 2.—

Relief.

I have heard the authorised representatives of both the parties and have gone through evidence placed on the file. My issue-wise findings are as under :—

Issue No. 1.—

In support of this issue respondent-management examined one Babu Ram as MW-1 who deposed that workman was employed on 12th May, 1981 as Helper and was terminated on 31st March, 1982. He categorically stated that before passing termination order no notice, no pay in lieu of notice period, no retrenchment compensation were given to the workman.

Shri Bhojraj, workman, examined himself as AW-1 and supported his case. He even stated that he had served the respondent even earlier to May, 1981.

In view of the above evidence it is clear that since 12th May, 1981 upto 31st March, 1982 workman served the department continuously. He completed his service more than 240 days; in these circumstances the respondent-management should have complied with the provisions of section 25(f) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947; in other words notice or pay-in lieu of notice period, retrenchment compensation should have been paid to the workman and the appropriate authority should have also been informed but no step was taken by the management which clearly shows that the management has wilfully violated the section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. So the alleged order of termination dated 31st March, 1982 cannot be sustained and is declared illegal and not binding on the workman and this issue is decided in the negative.

Issue No. 2.—

On the basis of my findings on issue No. 1 the workman is entitled to re-instatement with continuity in service as well as with full back wages. I pass my award accordingly regarding the dispute in question.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Dated the 14th August, 1985.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endst. No. 1956, dated 2nd September, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

The 21st October, 1985

No. 9/5/84-6 Lab/8471.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Gurera Gas Cylinder Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 133, Sector 24, Faridabad :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 438 of 1985

between

SHRI RAM TIWARI, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M/S GURERA
GAS CYLINDER PVT. LTD., PLOT NO. 133, SECTOR 24, FARIDABAD

Present :—

None for the workman.

Shri J. S. Saroha, for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This industrial dispute between the workman Shri Ram Tiwari and the respondent-management of M/s. Gurera Gas Cylinder Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 133, Sector 24, Faridabad has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/31493—98, dated 26th July, 1985, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication. The terms of the reference are:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Tiwari, was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

None appeared for the workman in spite of the fact that he has been served on the address given in the reference. It is 10.15 a.m. Hence the workman is proceeded *ex parte*. In *ex parte* statement, the management has contended that the workman has voluntarily resigned from the job. He has received the amount in full and final settlement of his claim. The photo copy of the resignation is Ex. M-1. and photo copy of the receipt of payment is Ex. M-2. In these circumstances, I find that the claimant has already settled his dispute as he has resigned his job. He is not entitled to any relief. The award is given accordingly.

Dated, the 25th September, 1985.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 2772, dated 26th September, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-6Lb/8472.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Gurera Gas Cylinder Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 133, Sector 24, Faridabad:—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 444 of 1985

between

SHRI DAMODAR TANTI, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF
M/S GURERA GAS CYLINDER PVT. LTD., PLOT NO. 133, SECTOR 24, FARIDABAD

Present :—

None for the workman.

Shri J. S. Saroha for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This industrial dispute between the workman Shri Damodar Tanti and the respondent-management of M/s. Gurera Gas Cylinder Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 133, Sector 24, Faridabad has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/31535—40, dated 26th July, 1985, under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication. The terms of the reference are :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Damodar Tanti was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

None appeared for the workman in spite of the fact that he has been served on the address given in the reference. It is 10.15 a. m. Hence the workman is proceeded *ex parte*. In *ex parte* statement, the management has contended that the workman has voluntarily resigned from the job. He has received the amount in full and final settlement of his claim. The photo copy of

resignation is Ex. M-1 and photo copy of the receipt of payment is Ex-M-2. In these circumstances, I find that the claimant has already settled his dispute as he has resigned his job. He is not entitled to any relief. The award is given accordingly.

Dated, the 25th September, 1985.

R. N. SINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2773, dated the 26th September, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

R. N. SINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-Lab/8473.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Gurera Gas Cylinder Pvt., Ltd., Plot No. 133, Sector 24, Faridabad :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 447 of 1985

between

SHRI UDAY SHANKAR, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF
M/S. GURERA GAS CYLINDER PVT. LTD., PLOT NO. 133, SECTOR 24,
FARIDABAD

Present :—

None for the workman.

Shri J. S. Saroha, for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This industrial dispute between the workman Shri Uday Shankar and the respondent-management of M/s Gurera Gas Cylinder, Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 133, Sector, 24, Faridabad has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, —vide his order No. ID/FD/31556—61, dated 26th July, 1985, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication. The terms of the reference are:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Uday Shankar, workman, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

None appeared for the workman in spite of the fact that he has been served on the address given in the reference. It is 10.15 a.m. Hence the workman is proceeded *ex parte*. In *ex parte* statement, the management has contended that the workman has voluntarily resigned from the job. He has received the amount in full and final settlement of his claim. The photo copy of resignation is Ex. M-1 and photo copy of the receipt of payment is Ex. M-2. In these circumstances, I find that the claimant has already settled his dispute as he has resigned his job. He is not entitled to any relief. The award is given accordingly.

R. N. SINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Dated, the 25th September, 1985.

Endst. No. 2774, dated 26th September, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

R. N. SINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.